

Mr. Harry Livingstone
P.O. Box 7149
Baltimore, Md. 21218

7/16/90

Dear Harry,

Although in the letter to which you respond under date of July 8, but postmarked the 14, I did say I would not carry this dispute farther in letters; after reading your letter I do respond to some. I'm just not taking the time for the rest, most of which consists of either repeated arguments without any substantiation in fact or misrepresentations of what I actually said.

The mail was late today. Almost noon when it arrived. In it there are seven letters to which I have to respond, plus four orders for books that + package. In addition, this is the first day in more than a week when I can mow and when I rest from that, as I do now, I'll write you. That will perhaps make it more disjointed but the fact is that if you ~~did~~ did not have a block on anything I said I'd not have to respond at all. I'll give you enough specifics, but I do not expect you not to twist them either.

The last thing you said is that we are entitled to disagree. Almost 100% of the people who have unsupervised access to my files and I do not agree. That has not and will not prevent them from having full access. As you could have had many times. You refer to now wanting me to go over the MDW file for you and make copies of some. How many times when you were here did you not do that when I urged you to each time? I'll copy the whole thing for you but unless Lil can find the time now I'll let it wait until I go into town. I can get it copied there for a quarter of our actual cost. We had no idea what it costs on our machine, which we bought on price, not economy, a big mistake, until a friend from of all things the National Enquirer was here and when we told him 10¢ a page he told us we were nuts, that the cost on such a machine is about 25¢. So, we sat down and calculated all the costs and it comes to that. Prohibitive! The last I had copied in ~~max~~ town was 7¢ a page. If Lil is willing to do it, that will get it to you faster. But I will not take the time to select what I think you want and I won't run the risk of your later claiming that I didn't give you all I should have. I can't do the other searching that you ask and I'll come to. + not only am not up to it, there are other demands on my time. The only thing I do that does not really take time is packaging the books. I'll do that tonight to the Orioles game. Of course it takes other time for Lil. I'm just the common labor on packaging and mailing the books.

You say in your letter that you did not have my letter in front of you but you attach a xeroxed excerpt, so you did find it. What I do not respond to (as well as some that I do) I think you should compare with what I actually said. You misrepresent even what you xeroxed and attached! I'll let that wait until I come to that in your letter. That will perhaps save you some time. But please do not expect me to continue this pointless argument, particularly not when you misrepresent what I said.

One other thing before I return to the mowing. You keep referring to the alleged incomprehensibility of my writing and I keep telling you that the unlettered have no trouble with it. About the time I wrote you I got a letter that is obviously from a man who is not loaded with PhDs. I copied it to send you when we wrote again. Now on this alleged incomprehensibility, is it that you can't even struggle through the indices? You have just asked me to check for you what you'll find in the index to Post Mortem. Come off it, Harry, you can't possibly tell me that you can't make sense out of it, that it is convoluted or whatever else you said! *An index?*

You're alleging I made "charges against" you. I don't think I ever have. Be specific on "charges," not disagreements.

You refer to your bringing an AP reporter here in 1979 and that he wrote a story in which he used what I said to ridicule you. You were present and if I'd actually said anything that ridiculed you, why did you not speak up then? Now on the other hand, if you expect me to tell anyone anything other than what I believe you expect what I'll not do.

I have to stand on my feet, you on yours. I have only a vague recollection of your bringing someone but if you think there is something in the story for which I should apologize, please send me a copy and I'll see.

At the bottom of page 2 you say "the X-rays of the head show the right front of the face gone" Which I do not recall seeing or having heard anyone say, but the photos do not show this. Then you say what I've always said, before anyone else and more often, that "the picture of the back of the head are (sc) incompatible with the clinical medical evidence." Well, I didn't say that about the pictures but I said it about all else and then with regard to the Clark reports.

On page three you deny that you said the ambulance came at 4 p.m. and I don't recall that I said you said it. If you'll look again at what you twist, for what purpose I don't know, the xerox of what I actually said that you attach, you'll see that what I actually said is, "but as I remember, it was 4 p.m. Burkley had the radio operator make arrangements from AFI for the autopsy to be done at Bethesda." I also said I wasn't sure of the time the ambulance got there. You say 6:00. My recollection is that it was about 6:15 and that it stopped at the front to let Jackie and perhaps others out.

The time you say is not accounted for is accounted for, whether or not you and people like Lifton believe it, but you apparently are unfamiliar with the existing records of various kinds. Maybe the MDW file will establish this for you. At least an arrival. Do Sibert and O'Neill give the time the body was removed from the casket? *Manchester?*

If as I will not take time for, it being silly, I took the time to show you that at Parkland the body was never unattended, your reply would be or at least include the entirely baseless allegation that you have taken to heart, that the Secret Service escort was part of the plot. You say that in this letter, this very paragraph.

If you really believe that I misrepresent what you actually said about that part of your imagined conspiracy, which you quote as "It could have happened. We don't know that it did not." please quote my words, not your interpretation, of the entire thing that you said and I said. Both.

At several points at the top of page 4 you flaunt a lack of knowledge of bullets, their design and how they perform. You begin by saying that the Dallas doctors "damned sure knew" that JFK had been struck in the anterior neck. They said it several times but that is not what Perry testified to and it is not what he told me. I agree that they at least had reason to believe there was an anterior neck entrance wound. You follow by saying "The average (your emphasis) bullet does not leave the body after entrance." First of all, there is no such thing as an "average" bullet. And, quite obviously, except for your invention of convenience, they do leave the body. Even the smallest, like 22s. Witness the Bobby Kennedy case, to select what you may know a little about. Now, assuming as I do not, that JFK was struck with the Mannlicher-Carcano ammo, that is designed, in accord with the Geneva convention, to make a through-and-through wound, the purpose of the hardened jacket. It is bullets that are intended/designed not to that do not. They are readily available commercially as hunting and varminting ammo. What is humanitarian for people is not humanitarian for animals and vice versa. And this is not the only point at which you merely run off at the mouth, making it up as you go. *(12/11/64)*

You can't have accidentally misunderstood what I said, in your version, page 6, "that leaving the evidence implicating ~~Oswald~~ Oswald accomplished nothing at all other than to give them lead time," which you say is "ridiculous." You say that framing Oswald was nothing more than 'icing on the cake.'" What I'm sure I actually said is that the purpose of leaving all that stuff was basically to give them time to get away and to misdirect the initial investigation, which added to the escape time. I did not say that they did not hope for more. I said that the essential thing for the assassins was to escape the locale. Anything else was, let me say, gravy. Not icing if you prefer not icing.

As you could have done by using the indices you can still do with the weight of the bullet. What kids can handle without real trouble has thrown you, but get back on your

feet like a big boy and see what I have in particular in Post Mortem on bullets and the weight of 399. Which does not by any means exhaust what you used as sources and does not exhaust what was readily available to you and about which you knew and could have used, my depositions, of Frazier and Gallagher in particular. *FCA litigation*

You next quote me as saying that with regard to the Connally wounds, fragments "were allegedly washed away," which I am supposed to have said means they could not have come from CE 399. The latter is true, those fragments could not have come from 399, although I do not recall putting it that way. "Allegedly?" And you spent all that time with those Dallas doctors? Read the Commission testimony? And say "allegedly?"

What I'm beginning to wonder about is how you could quote Post Mortem and be so ignorant of it. I think it is as I said, you quoted those who quoted it, with and without saying they were using it.

"...I sent you my medical chapters and I changed the galleys with every single change (at some considerable expense) which you requested." I did not request anything of you and while I've not checked and don't really care, it is my recollection that you were in Canada and you told me it was too late, that the type was in page and you couldn't make those changes that I thought in your own interest you should. This is pretty well fixed in my mind because I would not have gone to that trouble if I had not believed that you wanted to know so you could be accurate, and asking me when it was too late was an imposition. There were other things I ~~had~~ have preferred doing with that time.

Next you complain that I did not take you "by the scruff of the neck" and "drag me down to your dungeon and thrust in front of me everything I need to know. You didn't do it because you are territorial, and you didn't want me to know." This is truly shameful and shameful. You, like everyone else, had unrestricted access. I even told you that while the files I got are so ~~far~~ great in volume the volume alone denies access I did make duplicate copies for subject filing and I told you where they were. You know very well from the things I've told you that I can't and don't supervise what people go through nor do I know what they copy. They have unsupervised access and from time to time, not often, fortunately, as I also told you, they steal. In the past couple of months I got others to help me, where complete files were requested, because after the open-heart surgery I had and have this prohibition on lifting, and I had close to 10,000 copies made for two different requests. I even advanced the cost of commercial copying and UPS. If you are not so utterly lost in your defensiveness, you'd be ashamed to say anything like this not only because you know better but also because you have no other knowledge, no basis at all for that "territorial bullshit".

I've indicated all I can recall on Marchetti (page 7) and I tell you again, you are welcome to go over the notes I made and any clippings I may have filed.

You want documentation on what Garrison "had obtained" (which is not what I said, in his suit. I said he'd won, the government noted an appeal, and he chickened out. I do not know what copies or records I have but the best source is Bud Fensterwald. He was of counsel and I'm sure he has records and someone to do the searching and copying.

You say the first thing that comes into your mind as as soon as you spew it out it becomes instant truth to you. When in the hell do you get off even offering an opinion on Ray's guilt or innocence? What do you know about that matter? If you think we did not exculpate him, ask Jim Lesar, who did most of the in-court work and just about all the preparation I didn't do. Yet you say he "never could have proved his innocence," based on your combination of sublime ignorance and facility for saying whatever seems expedient. I say we did prove his innocence, although that was not the purpose of the evidentiary hearing. And if I didn't say so, it was my idea, Bud being abroad and Jim overwhelmed.

Get hold of yourself, Harry. You make much of this up and are pretty irresponsible with a lot more. With regard to your book, I've done nothing to hurt it, I've refused to comment on it the one time I was asked, and I've taken no initiatives, which should be obvious to you. I've in fact told people how to reach you and get it....Get hold of yourself!

Harry